DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 396 HE 021 087

AUTHOR Ward, Billy L.; Shrout, John R.
TITLE Planning Activities and Organization for Planning at Four-Year Public Institutions of Higher Education.
PUB DATE 29 Oct 87
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Southern Association for Institutional Research and the Society for College and University Planning (New Orleans, LA, October 28-30, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization; *College Administration; *College Planning; Higher Education; Needs Assessment; Objectives; Resource Allocation; *Small Colleges; *State Colleges; State Universities; Surveys; *Time Management

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted to determine: (1) what percentage of total planning time of the various personnel involved in institutional planning is allocated to the several planning functions; and (2) how planning functions are organized at small four-year public institutions. A questionnaire was mailed to the chief executive officers of 188 state-controlled institutions with enrollments of 6,000 full-time-equivalent (FTE) students or less. The chief executive officers were asked to distribute the questionnaires within their institutions for response. Responses were received from 125 institutions, for a 66.5% response rate. Results included the following: generally, a higher percentage of time is spent in setting goals and objectives than is spent in other planning functions; and smaller institutions (2,000 FTE or less) were less likely to have a person designated as chief planning officer than the larger institutions. The survey instrument is appended. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED290396

Planning Activities and Organization for Planning At Four-Year Public Institutions of Higher Education

Paper Presentation

By

Dr. Billy L. Ward
Mr. John R. Shrout

1987 Annual Conference
of
The Southern Association for Institutional Research
and
The Society for College and University Planning

New Orleans, Louisianna

October 29, 1987

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SAIR-SCUP

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 021 087

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

Authorities in the area of higher education planning (Caruthers & Lott, 1981; Shirley, 1983; Peck, 1983) are in general agreement that the survival of many institutions of higher education, especially small colleges and universities, depends upon a realisitic assessment of institutional resources and environmental constraints. Wiseman (1976) discusses the large expenditures of time and money involved in designing, testing, and implementing planning systems. Wiseman noted that most successful planning systems in the classical form presuppose rather stable organizational structures and are based on getting the optimum productivity out of an organization. Research is needed on commitment of resources to panning efforts, especially the time requirement of chief executive officers, chief planning officers, deans and department chairpersons, and others associated with the formal planning processes of the institution.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of the study were; (a) to determine what percentage of total planning time of the various personnel involved institutional planning is allocated to the several planning functions; and (b) to determine how planning functions are organized at small 4-year public institutions.

Literature Review

It is noteworthy that very few research findings have been reported concerning organization for planning higher education. Shirley (1983) indicated that while some research has been conducted on organizational strategy and planning for business and industry, higher education represents a virtually untapped area. He noted that research is needed to determine how institutions are presently organized for planning.

The Ohio Board of Regents (1974) noted that one of the characteristics of an effective institutional planning system was that it is consciously and formally organized. In planning systems considered the most effective, line administrators are held accountable for formulating policies which promote the future and taking actions which support the goals, directions, and policies formulated.

Weathersby (1984) identified four pressures which he feels are particularily challenging for state colleges and universities. First, there is an increasing competitiveness among institutions as they seek to maintain or increase enrollments. Second, program quality is an area in which state colleges are particularily sensitive. Third, program costs at state colleges are usually higher because of economies of scale. Fourth, markets for consumers of postsecondary educational services are rapidly changing and state colleges are particularly. Weathersby continued that major public policy decisions just be made concerning state colleges and their roles in the higher education sector.

Methodology

A questionnaire was developed and mailed to the chief executive officers of 188 AASCU member institutions that were state controlled, public institution with enrollments of 6,000 FTE students or less. The chief executive officers were asked to distribute questionnaires to chief planning officers, planning committee chairpersons, deans and department chairpersons on the institutional planning committee, and individual faculty members serving on the institutional planning committee. Each of these persons were instructed to return the questionaires directly to the researcher.

A follow-up procedure was used after a six-week waiting period. Responses were received from a total of 125 institutions, for a 66.5% response rate.

Use of Planning Time by Selected Institutional Personnel

Percentage of Total Planning time Allocated to Various Planning Elements

The first purpose of this study was to determine the amount of total planning time which selected personnel involved in the planning process allocated to the various planning functions. These persons were consider members of the institutional planning team for purposes of the study. In order to accomplish this purpose, the different members of the institutional planning team were asked to provide an estimate of the percentage of total planning time spent on each of nine planning elements. Table 1 shows that, generally, a higher percentage of time is spent in setting goals and objectives by

members of the planning team than is spent in other planning functions. Other elements found to require somewhat higher percentages of time include needs analysis, development and selection of alternative strategies, and supervision of the adopted plan to achieve objectives. On the other hand, allocation of resources was found to require less time than other elements.

In conjunction with examining use of planning time by selected institutional personnel the following hypothesis was developed and tested:

> There is no significant difference in the percentage of total planning time allocated to the various planning functions between chief executive officers, chief planning officers, planning committee chairpersons, individual faculty members, deans, and department chairpersons serving on planning committees.

The hypothesis was tested using a paired t test of mean differences between the chief planning officers, chief executive officers and other team members of each of the nine planning elements. A significant difference (Table 2) was noted on three of the planning elements. The chief executive and the chief planning officer were significantly different in percentage of time spent in setting goals and objectives. A t of -3.85 was obtained which was significant at $p < .05$. There was also a significant difference ($t = 2.07$, $p < .05$) between the chief planning officer and chief executive

Table 1

Mean Percentage of Total Planning Time Allocated to the Various Planning Elements by Member of the Institutional Planning Team

Planning element	Planning team members*				
	CEO	PO	CHP	DD	IF
1. Setting goals and objectives	26.1	15.6	14.3	14.7	13.3
2. Needs analysis	10.6	12.4	14.0	11.0	14.0
3. Developing and selecting alternative strategies to achieve objectives	12.2	13.4	12.3	12.0	12.6
4. Calculating resource requirements	9.4	10.1	9.1	9.8	11.7
5. Comparing resource requirements to available resources	9.7.	10.2	9.2	7.1	10.8
6. Allocation of resources	7.3	8.3	8.2	7.4	9.9
7. Planning program management system	7.2	14.3	8.1	7.5	6.6
8. Supervision of the adopted plan	10.4	9.1	12.7	24.1	9.6
9. Program review and evaluation	9.5	10.6	11.3	8.9	12.2

Note: CEO= chief executive officer, PO= planning officer, CHP= planning committee chairperson, DD= deans and department chairpersons, and IF= individual faculty.

*The percentages cited are means percentages and will not necessarily total 100% per column.

Table 2

Results of Paired t Tests Comparing the Amount of Time Chief Planning Officers and Various Members of the Institutional Planning Team Spent in Various Planning Elements

	Planning elements	Planning team members							
		CEO		CHP		DD		IP	
		t	df	t	df	t	df	t	df
1.	Setting goals and objectives	-3.85*	48	-0.91	36	0.46	31	-0.50	31
2.	Needs analysis	1.69	44	-0.94	34	0.28	38	-1.13	26
3.	Developing and selecting alternative strategies to achieve objectives	-1.14	49	-0.80	33	0.06	32	-0.96	28
4.	Calculating resource requirements	1.05	42	0.82	31	0.35	33	1.03	27
5.	Comparing resource requirements to available resources	0.84	47	1.85	30	1.74	32	0.28	25
6.	Allocation of resources	-0.28	44	1.19	27	0.80	27	1.60	18
7.	Planning program management system	2.07*	36	1.58	29	0.50	25	-1.81	19
8.	Supervision of the adopted plan	1.66	35	-0.96	29	-4.72*	31	0.72	17
9.	Program review and evaluation	0.65	45	-1.40	33	-1.18	32	-1.19	26

*Two-tailed $p < .05$.

Note: CEO = chief executive officer, PO = planning officer, CHP = planning committee chairperson, DD = deans and department chairperson, and IP = individual faculty.

officer in the time allocated to planning the program management system Another item for which a significant difference existed was related to supervision of the adopted plan. This difference existed between the chief planning officer and the deans and department chairpersons. The t value was 4.72 with 31 df. The null hypothesis, therefore, was rejected on these three elements.

Total Number of Hours Per Year Allocated to Planning

Respondents were asked to provide an estimate of the total number of hours actually spent in planning tasks each year. The mean number of hours spent by these members of the planning team were (a) chief executive officer--334.4, (b) chief planning officer--731.6, (c) planning committee chairpersons--271.8, (d) deans and department chairpersons--235.5, and (e) individual faculty--143.4.

A second hypothesis was developed and tested in connection with this inquiry:

> There is no significant difference in the total hours per year allocated to planning between chief executive officers, planning committee chairpersons, individual faculty members serving on the planning committee, and deans and department chairpersons serving on the planning committee.

Table 3 shows that 32 (54.3%) of 59 chief planning officers responding to the survey spent greater that 500 hours per year involved in planning activities. On the other hand, the majority of chief executives, committee chairpersons, individual faculty, and deans and department chairpersons serving on the planning committee indicated that they generally spent less that 250 hours per year on planning activities. The analysis produced a X of 68.99 ($p < .0001$, .8 df). The null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 3

Chi-Square Analysis of the Total Number of Hours Spent in Planning Activities Per Year By Various Members of the Institutional Planning Team

Hours spent In Planning	Planning team members					
	CEO N	PO N	CHP N	DD N	IF N	X
0-250	60	11	33	34	40	-
251-500	21	16	13	6	4	-
Over 500	18	32	8	6	2	-
Totals	99	59	54	46	46	68.99*

*$p < .0001$, 8 df.

Note: CEO = chief executive officer, PO = planning officer, CHP = planning committee chairperson, DD = deans and department chairperson, and IF = individual faculty.

Organization for Planning

The second purpose was to determine how planning functions are organized at small, 4-year public institutions. In that regard, Questions 2-12 of the questionnaire (Appendix) designed to provide these data. Additionally, much information also was gathered through the comments section (Question 15) of the questionnaires well as from personal letters sent by presidents and planning officers. A statistical test of significance was not used in this analysis since the date did not lend themselves to statistical treatment.

One-hundred and twenty-one institutions responded to Questions 2 which asked if the institution had a person designated as a chief planning officer. Table 4 indicates that the smaller institutions (0-2,000 FTE) were less likely to have a person designated as chief planning officer that institutions within the tow upper subgroups (2,001-4, 000 and 4,001-6,000), respectively.

Table 4

Presence of Institutional Planning Officers at Small, 4-Year Public Colleges and Universities

Institutional size	Chief Planning Officer	
	Yes	No
1,001-2,000	14	15
2,001-4,000	31	15
4,001-6,000	26	20
Totals	71	50

Many of those institutions with a negative response indicated various reasons for not having a person designated as a chief planning officer. Four of the respondents indicated that planning was a team effort with responsibility for planning spreads throughout the institution with no one particular person having overall responsibility for coordinating the effort. Four institutions indicated that the chief executive officer served with planning responsibilities as a part of his or her normal duties. A chief executive of one of the smaller institutions indicated that his institution was a small school, and, although they recognize the importance of planning, there are too many administrative tasks that need immediate attention and too few individuals to complete them. According to this chief executive, planning is, therefore, not accomplished at this institution.

One institution commented that many state systems of higher education have their own planning models and requirements which are not necessarily synchronized with the individual campus' needs. One

respondent said that planning at institutions within such systems was different than at other institutions. No further elaboration as to why planning is different at these institutions was given.

Question 2 requested the title of the chief planning officer. Those persons designated as chief planning officers included 24.2% at the vice-presidential or vice-chancellor level (Table 5). Those institutions responding to this question indicated that 30.6% had a person responsible for planning at the directory level. The Director of Institutional Research also served as the chief planning officer at 9.7% of these institutions. Other common titles of persons designated as chief planning officers include Assistant to the President, Director of Administrative Services, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, and Assistant Vice-President for Academic Affairs.

In response to Question 4, 73.8% of the respondents indicated that the chief planning officer reported to the chief executive officer, and 20% said that the planning officer was responsible to the chief academic officer. Thus, 93.8% of the institutions with a chief planning officer regarded the position highly enough for the person in the position to report to a significant level of the administrative structure. The remaining 6.2% of the respondents reported that the planning officer was responsible to the chief business officer, chief administrative officer for research/operations, or other category. Table 6 shows a numerical breakdown of this information.

Table 5

Titles of Chief Planning Officers at Small, 4-Year Public Colleges and Universities by Institution Size

Chief Planning Officer Title	Institution Size 0-2,000 N	2,001-4,000 N	4,001-6000 N
Vice president/ vice chancellor	3	5	7
Director of planning	3	10	6
Director of institutional research	2	3	2
Other	5	8	9

Table 6

Persons to Whom Planning Officers Report at Small, 4-Year Public Colleges and Universities by Institution Size

Chief planning officers reports	Institution Size 0-2,000 N	1,001-4,000 N	4,001-6,000 N
Chief executive officer	8	23	17
Chief academic officer	4	5	4
Chief business officer	0	0	1
Chief administrative/ research officer	0	1	0
Other	1	0	1

Question 5 requested an estimate concerning the amount of time that the chief planning officer actually spends in assignments other than planning. The mean percentage of time spent by the planning officer in nonplanning activities was 58.1%. The mode was 50% and the median 59.86%. This estimate was with 5% of the total mean time devoted to planning activities estimated by the planning officers themselves.

One hundred and twenty institutions responded to Question 6 and 90 (75%) indicated that a planning committee existed on the campus. When the response was broken down into subgroup responses by size of institutions (0-2,000 , 2,001-4,000 , 4,001-6,000), the larger institutions with in the sample were more likely to have a committee with a responsibility of planning. For instance, 91.1% of the institutions in the 4,001 -6,000 FTE category responded yes. The 2,001-4,000 FTE group indicated that 63% had planning committees and 69% of the 0-2,000 FTE group had a yes response to the question. Table 7 provides a detailed presentation of this information.

Table 7

Presence of Institutional Planning Committee at Small, 4-Year Public Colleges and Universities

Institution Size	Number of institutions	
	Committee exists	No committee
0-2,000	20	9
2,001-4,000	29	17
4,001-6,000	41	4

Question 7 listed six items or possibilities concerning the role of the planning committee. Table 8 provides a description of the various institutional responses to the questions. Item 1, develops and recommends policies and processes for planning, received a 66.7% response from the 90 colleges and universities which indicated that a planning committee existed on the campus.

Item 2, recommends content and design of data for institutional planning, received only a 52.5% response. Item 3, synthesizes unit plans into institution-wide plan, drew a 65.5% response. Item 4, coordinates college/departmental planning received a response rate of 51.1%. Item 5, serves as a review board for institutional planning, received a response of 67.8% from institutions with planning committees. Responses to Item 6 indicated that the 90 small public institutions with planning committees are more likely to have the planning committee serving in an advisory capacity to the chief executive officer as evidenced by an 83.3% response to the item.

Question 8 sought information on the composition for the institution's planning committee in terms of the number of faculty, administrators, and other classification. The mean number of faculty on the committee was 5.39, the mode was 4.00, and the median was 5.33. The mean number of administrators on the committee was 4.58, the mode was 4.00, and the median was 3.93. In terms of other persons serving on the committee, the mean was 2.96, the mode was 2, and the median was 2.42. Several respondents indicated the other category consisted of students, alumni, local leaders, benefactors, and trustees.

Table 8

Role of Planning Committees at Small, 4-Year Public Colleges and Universities

Role	Response Percentage
1. Develops and recommends policies and procedures for planning.	66.7
2. Recommends content and design of data for institutional planning.	52.2
3. Synthesizes unit plans into institution-wide plan.	65.5
4. Coordinates college/departmental planning	51.1
5. Serves as a review board for institutional planning	67.8
6. Serves in an advisory capacity to the chief executive officer.	83.3

Question 9 requested the committee chairperson's classification. Eighty-one institutions responded to the question with 61% indicating that an administrator was the chairperson. Faculty served as chairpersons in 37.8% of the institutions. Only 1 (1.2%) institution said that a person other than an administrator or faculty member served as chairperson. It is particularly noteworthy, as noted in the response to Question 8, that although more faculty are present on the planning committee, the chairperson was more likely to be an administrator.

In response to Question 10, which requested the relationship of the institution's planning committee and the chief planning officer, 81.7% of the institutions with planning committees also indicated the presence of a planning officer on the campus. Table 9 provides this information.

The committee's relationship to the chief planning officer was advisory at 79.2% of the institutions. Only 5.7% indicated that the committee's relationship was supervisory. Another 15.1% said that the relationship was in the other category. Of this group, approximately one-half marked advisory and supervisory. While this relationship may appear illogical, nevertheless, it does exist. The other institutions offered no explanation of the other category response.

Table 9

Presence of Planning Committees and Planning Officers at Small, 4-Year Public Colleges and Universities

Planning Officer	Planning Committee	
	Yes	No
Institutions with planning officer	58	13
Institutions without planning officer	31	17

Question 11 requested that the institutions indicate the number of personnel by category in the office bearing primary responsibility for planning at the institution. The categories provided for this write-in response were professional, technical, and clerical. Ninety-one institutions responded to the question. The mean number of professional staff in the office bearing primary responsibility for planning was 1.9, the mode was 1.0, and the median was 1.3 . Technical staff were reported with a mean of 1.15, a mode of 1.0, and a median of 1.16.

Question 12 asked the institutions to provide the number of years that the planning organization had been in place at the institution. The mean number of years that the planning organization had been in place at the respondent institutions was a 5.3 years, the mode was 2.0 years, and the median was 4.11 years.

Effects of Institutional Size Upon Institutional Planning Activities

Correlation analysis was used to study effects of size (enrollment) of the institution upon the number of hours annually devoted to planning activities by persons on the institutional planning team, number of personnel employed in the office bearing primary responsibility for institutional planning, and number of personnel on the institutional planning committee. Other relationships studied were number of years that the institutional planning process had been in place as related to the number of personnel employed in the office bearing primary responsibility for planning.

When enrollment was compared with the number of hours spent by the chairperson of planning committee on planning activities, the result was a correlation coefficient r of -0.2906 ($p < .05$). Enrollment compared with number of hours spent by deans and department chairpersons on planning produced and r of -0.2290 ($p < .05$). Enrollment with the number of faculty on the institutional planning committee produced an r of 0.2582 ($p < .05$).

As mentioned previously, the other relationships attempted were not considered significant. Findings of the study also revealed that significant relationships existed between enrollment at an institution and the number of hours spent by the chief executive, chief planning officer, and individual faculty members on planning activities each year. However, no significant correlation was found to exist between enrollment and the number of persons employed in the office bearing primary responsibility for planning at these smaller colleges and universities. Furthermore, the number of years a planning organization has been in place at an institution was not found to be related to the number of the personnel employed in the planning office or on the number of hours spent in planning activities by members of the institutional planning team.

APPENDIX

Institutional Planning in Small State Colleges & Universities in America

A National Survey

Under Sponsorship of
The American Association of
State Colleges and Universities

aascu

American Association of State Colleges and Universities One Dupont Circle/Suite 700/Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 293-7070

May 25, 1984

MEMORANDUM

TO: Presidents and Chancellors of State Colleges and Universities with Full-Time Equivalent Enrollments of 6000 students or less

FROM: Harold Delaney, Executive Vice President
Meredith Ludwig, Senior Coordinator, Association Research

SUBJECT: Participation in a Study on the Organization of Formal Planning Activities at Small Public 4-year Higher Education Institutions

---

Enclosed you will find a survey instrument designed by Mr. Billy L. Ward of Livingston University in Alabama. This is part of a dissertation research effort by Mr. Ward to study the formal planning activities currently found at AASCU member institutions. The study comes from a concern that little information is available to chief executive officers of colleges and universities about formal planning structures, including the purposes served by formal planning activities, the individuals involved in the planning process, and the time spent by each individual in planning activities.

Following AASCU procedures, the survey and the background proposal were both reviewed by AASCU's Committee on Association Research. Nearly one-half the committee members commented on the usefulness of the study and the questions asked. The committee respondents generally agreed that the information provided from this survey would be useful, especially for chief executives preparing to establish formal planning structures at their own institutions. The changes recommended by committee members have been incorporated into the survey instrument. As a result, we feel that AASCU should support this research effort.

We encourage you to participate by completing the survey instrument. Detailed instructions are provided by Mr. Ward along with the instrument. The results of the study will be reported fully in MEMO: to the president as soon as they have been tabulated. Thank you for your support. As always, we welcome your comments on the research conducted and supported by the Association.

Chairman, Joseph J. Orze, President, Northwestern State University of Louisiana Chairman-Elect Aubrey K. Lucas, President, University of Southern Mississippi Past Chairman James W. Cleary, President, California State University, Northridge Secretary/Treasurer Janet G. Murphy, Missouri Western State College President Allan W. Ostar

Directors Harold Abel, President Central Michigan University Warren J. Baker, President California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo Frank H. Blackington III, President University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown, PA Alice Chandler, President State University College of Arts and Science at New Paltz, NY Myron L. Coulter, President Idaho State University H. Douglas Covington, Chancellor Winston-Salem State University, NC Henry Givens, President Harris Stowe College, MO Eugene M. Hughes, President Northern Arizona University Hoke L. Smith, President Towson State University, MD Lloyd I. Watkins, President Illinois State University Albert A. Walker, President Dickinson State College, ND Del Weber, Chancellor University of Nebraska at Omaha

Executive Offices, AASCU, Washington, D.C.

Institutional Planning
in
Small State Colleges & Universities
in America

1. Twelve purposes that planning may serve are listed below. Please indicate, by circling the appropriate numbers, how often, on an *ideal* level, planning should serve each of the listed purposes at your institution. Use the scale (1) Never, (2) Occasionally, (3) Frequently, (4) Continuously.

N	O	F	C	
1	2	3	4	I. To improve institutional efficiency and cost effectiveness.
1	2	3	4	II. To ensure more systematic collection and analysis of data.
1	2	3	4	III. To present clear institutional picture to external groups (including alumni).
1	2	3	4	IV. To contribute to positive public relations.
1	2	3	4	V. To aid in seeking additional resources from external funding sources such as federal, state, foundation, etc.
1	2	3	4	VI. To improve internal confidence and cooperation.
1	2	3	4	VII. To improve the communication of information throughout the organization.
1	2	3	4	VIII. To reduce internal conflict.
1	2	3	4	IX. To enhance the accreditation process.
1	2	3	4	X. To provide a sense of job security for employees.
1	2	3	4	XI. To help establish goals and priorities for institutional development.
1	2	3	4	XII. To ensure the effective use of available resources.

2. Does your institution have a person designated as the chief planning officer? Yes _____ No ___ (If *no*, go to Question 6.)

3. What is the title of the chief planning officer?

4. To whom does the chief planning officer report?

_____ a. Chief executive officer
_____ b. Chief business officer
_____ c. Chief academic officer
_____ d. Chief administrative officer for reasearch/operations
_____ e. Other

5. Approximately what percentage of the chief planning officer's time is actually spent in assignments other than planning? _____%

6. Does your institution have a committee which has a responsibility for planning? Yes _____ No ___ (If *no*, go to question 11.)

7. The planning committee (Check all items that apply.)

_____ a. develops and recommends policies and processes for planning.
_____ b. recommends content and design of data for institutional planning.
_____ c. synthesizes unit plans into institution-wide plan.
_____ d. coordinates college/departmental planning.
_____ e. serves as a review board for institutional planning.
_____ d. serves in an advisory capacity to the chief executive officer.

8. What is the composition of the planning committee? (Specify number of persons in each category.)

Faculty _____ Administrators _____ Other _____

9. What is the committee chairperson's classification? (Check the appropriate item.)

Faculty _____ Administrator _____ Other _____

10. If your institution has both a planning committee and a chief planning officer, what is the relationship of the committee to the chief planning officer? (e.g., advisory, supervisory, or other relationship)

Remarks _____

(Place additional remarks on back of questionnaire if necessary.)

11. Indicate the number of personnel by category in the office bearing primary responsibility for planning at your institution.

Professional _____ Technical _____ Clerical _____

(Please continue to the next page)

12. How long has the present planning organization been in place at your institution?_____ years.

13. Please indicate, by circling the appropriate numbers, how often you believe planning actually serves each of the below stated purposes at your institution. Use the scale (1) Never, (2) Occasionally, (3) Frequently, (4) Continuously.

N	O	F	C	
1	2	3	4	I. To improve institutional efficiency and cost efficiency
1	2	3	4	II. To ensure more systematic collection and analysis of data.
1	2	3	4	III. To present clear institutional picture to external groups (including alumni).
1	2	3	4	IV. To contribute to positive public relations.
1	2	3	4	V. To aid in seeking additional resources from external funding sources such as federal, state, foundation, etc.
1	2	3	4	VI. To improve internal confidence and cooperation
1	2	3	4	VII. To improve the communication of information throughout the organization.
1	2	3	4	VIII. To reduce internal conflict.
1	2	3	4	IX. To enhance the accreditation process.
1	2	3	4	X. To provide a sense of job security for employees.
1	2	3	4	XI. To help establish goals and priorities for institutional development.
				XII. To ensure the effective use of available resources.

14. Please estimate the percent of *total available planning time* that you as an individual devote to the different institutional planning elements listed below.

Setting goals and objectives	_____ %
Needs analysis	_____ %
Developing and selecting alternative strategies to achieve goals and objectives	_____ %
Calculating resource requirements	_____ %
Comparing resource requirements to available resources	_____ %
Allocation of resources	_____ %
Planning program management system	_____ %
Supervision of the adopted plan	_____ %
Program review and evaluation	_____ %
TOTAL	100%

Think about a week or a month in your year and get some idea about the number of hours spent on formal institutional planning tasks or activities and then estimate as reasonably and accurately as you can the number of hours spent on formal institutional planning in your year.

_____ number of hours spent on planning actvities in ( ) academic year or ( ) calendar year.

15. Comments (add additional pages as necessary)

Please return this questionnaire to:

Billy L. Ward, Livingston University, Station 18, Livingston, AL 35470